UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/945,535	08/30/2001	Kie Y. Ahn	1303.026US1	2681

21186 7590 08/23/2005

SCHWEGMAN, LUNDBERG, WOESSNER & KLUTH, P.A.
P.O. BOX 2938
MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55402-0938

EXAMINER	
BLUM, DAVID S	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2813	

DATE MAILED: 08/23/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/945,535	AHN ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	David S. Blum	2813	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *13 June 2005* .

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1,2,4-10,12-15,17-23,25-31,33-37,51,52 and 54-56* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1,2,4-10,12-15,17-23,25-31,33-37,51,52 and 54-56* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

11)☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a)☐ approved b)☐ disapproved by the Examiner.

If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.

12)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

13)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____ .

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).

a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

15)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) *6/24/05* .
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: .

This action is in response to the remarks filed 6/13/05.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1-2, 4, 6, 14-15, 17, 19, 51-52, and 55-56 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ma (US6207589) in view of Park (US 5795808). Ma teaches all of the positive steps of claims 1-2, 4, 6, 14-15, 17, 19, 51-52, and 55-56 except for using electron beam evaporation to deposit the single element metal layer.

Regarding the process steps recited in the "product by process claims" of claims 51-52 and 54, the process steps are given no weight in product or device claims and the device is taught as recited below. In re Thorpe, 777 F.2d 695, 698, 227 USPQ 964, 966 (Fed. Cir 1985).

Ma teaches sputtering (column 2 line 20), chemical vapor deposition as an alternative (column 2 line 38) or as another alternative, **evaporation deposition** (column 2 lines 54-55), giving the three methods an art recognized equivalence. Ma is silent to the evaporation deposition method used; the broad group includes electron beam

evaporation. The evaporation deposition method may include a single metal (column 2 lines 65-67, zirconium, a group IVB element) and oxidizing the metal (column 3 lines 1-4) to form a metal alloy. The metal is amorphous (column 3 lines 53-55 and 60-62), and is directly on (contacting) the body region (figure 12).

Park teaches depositing a metal layer (zirconium as in the instant claims and Ma) by either sputtering or electron beam deposition (column 4 lines 22-27), giving the two an art recognized equivalence.

Regarding claims 14 and 51, the gate is coupled to the metal oxide layer (Ma figure 13).

Regarding claims 2, 16, and 52 both Ma (column 2 line 67) and Park (column 4 line 25) teach depositing a zirconium layer.

Regarding claims 4 and 17, the metal of Park is 99.0% pure or higher (column 4 lines 24-27).

Regarding claims 6 and 19, Ma teaches oxidizing at 400 degrees (column 3 line 2).

Regarding claim 56, the limitation of forming the layer with a conduction band offset in a range of 5.16-7.8 eV, as the process steps are identical and there is no teaching as to modifying the process to achieve the specified range, it is considered to be a range of

common use, and one skilled in the requisite art would know how to optimize the process to achieve this range.

These ranges are considered to involve routine optimization while it has been held to be within the level of ordinary skill in the art. As noted in In re Aller (105 USPQ233), the selection of reaction parameters such as temperature and concentration would have been obvious:

> "Normally, it is to be expected that a change in temperature, or in concentration, or in both, would be an unpatentable modification. Under some circumstances, however, changes such as these may impart patentability to a process if the particular ranges claimed produce a new and unexpected result which is different in kind and not merely degree from the results of the prior art. Such ranges are termed "critical ranges and the applicant has the burden of proving such criticality.... More particularly, where the general conditions of a claim are disclosed in the prior art, it is not inventive to discover the optimum or workable ranges by routine experimentation."
>
> In re Aller 105 USPQ233, 255 (CCPA 1955). See also In re Waite 77 USPQ 586 (CCPA 1948); In re Scherl 70 USPQ 204 (CCPA 1946); In re Irmscher 66 USPQ 314 (CCPA 1945); In re Norman 66 USPQ 308 (CCPA 1945); In re Swenson 56 USPQ 372 (CCPA 1942); In re Sola 25 USPQ 433 (CCPA 1935); In re Dreyfus 24 USPQ 52 (CCPA 1934).

One skilled in the requisite art at the time of the invention would have used any ranges or exact figures suitable to the method in the process of forming a gate oxide regarding band offsets using prior knowledge, experimentation, and observation with the apparatus used in order to optimize the process and produce the gate structure desired to the parameters desired.

It would be obvious to one skilled in the requisite art at the time of the invention to modify Ma by using electron beam evaporation as taught by Park to be an art recognized equivalent to sputtering.

3. Claims 5, 7, 18, and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ma (US6207589) in view of Park (US 5795808) and in further view of Yano (US5810923).

Ma and Park teach all of the positive steps of claims 5, 7, 18, and 20 as recited above in regard to claims 1and 14, except for the deposition temperature and the use of atomic oxygen.

Regarding claims 5 and 18, Park is silent as to the deposition temperature when using electron beam evaporation. Yano teaches zirconium is deposited at 300-700 degrees C, within the range of the instant claim.

Regarding claims 7 and 20, Yano oxidized with atomic oxygen (column 21, lines 35-36, oxygen, ozone, atomic oxygen, and NO2, teaching an art recognized equivalence), suggesting Ma also use atomic oxygen.

It would be obvious to one skilled in the requisite art at the time of the invention to modify Ma and Park to use a known deposition range for electron beam evaporation of zirconium as taught by Yano and to use atomic oxygen as taught by Yano to be an art

recognized equivalence to oxygen. One would not perform undue and expensive laboratory efforts to obtain known values.

4. Claims 8, 21, and 54 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ma (US6207589) in view of Park (US 5795808) and in further view of Moise (US 006211035).

Ma and Park teach all of the positive steps of claims 8, 21, and 54 as recited above in regard to claims 1, 14, and 51 except for oxidizing in a krypton/oxygen mixed plasma.

Ma teaches annealing in an oxygen plasma including inert gases such as argon, and nitrogen (column 6 lines 64-65). Moise teaches oxidizing a metal layer with inert gasses such as argon or krypton (column 12 lines 23-24) giving the two an art recognized equivalence.

It would be obvious to one skilled in the requisite art at the time of the invention to modify Ma and Park by oxidizing a metal layer with inert gasses such as argon or krypton (column 12 lines 23-24) as taught by Moise to have an art recognized equivalence.

5. Claims 9-10 and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ma (US6207589) in view of Park (US 5795808) and in further view of Moise (US006211035).

Ma teaches all of the positive steps of claims 9-10 and 12 except for using electron beam evaporation to deposit the single element metal layer and oxidizing in a krypton/oxygen mixed plasma.

Ma teaches sputtering (column 2 line 20), chemical vapor deposition as an alternative (column 2 line 38) or as another alternative, evaporation deposition (column 2 lines 54-55), giving the three methods an art recognized equivalence. Ma is silent to the evaporation deposition method used; the broad group includes electron beam evaporation. The evaporation deposition method may include a single metal (column 2 lines 65-67) and oxidizing the metal (column 3 lines 1-4) to form a metal alloy. The metal is amorphous (column 3 lines 53-55 and 60-62), and is directly on (contacting) the body region (figure 12).

Park teaches depositing a metal layer (zirconium as in the instant claims and Ma) by either sputtering or electron beam deposition (column 4 lines 22-27), giving the two an art recognized equivalence.

Ma teaches annealing in an oxygen plasma including inert gases such as argon, and nitrogen (column 6 lines 64-65). Moise teaches oxidizing a metal layer with inert gasses such as argon or krypton (column 12 lines 23-24) giving the two an art recognized equivalence.

Regarding claim 10, both Ma (column 2 line 67) and Park) column 4 line 25) teach depositing a zirconium layer.

Regarding claim 12, the metal of Park is 99.0% pure or higher (column 4 lines 24-27).

It would be obvious to one skilled in the requisite art at the time of the invention to modify Ma by using electron beam evaporation as taught by Park to be an art recognized equivalent to sputtering, and to oxidize a metal layer with inert gasses such as argon or krypton (column 12 lines 23-24) as taught by Moise to have an art recognized equivalence.

6. Claim 13 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ma (US6207589) in view of Park (US 5795808) and Moise (US006211035) and in further view of Yano (US5810923).

Ma, Park, and Moise teach all of the positive steps of claim 13 as recited above in regard to claim 9, except for the deposition temperature.

Regarding claim 13, Park is silent as to the deposition temperature when using electron beam evaporation. Yano teaches zirconium is deposited at 300-700 degrees C, within the range of the instant claim.

It would be obvious to one skilled in the requisite art at the time of the invention to modify Ma and Park to use a known deposition range for electron beam evaporation of zirconium as taught by Yano. One would not perform undue and expensive laboratory efforts to obtain known values.

7. Claims 22-23, 25, 27, 30-31, 33, and 35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ma (US6207589) in view of Park (US 5795808) and in further view of Maiti (US6020024) and the admitted prior art (pages 1-4).
Ma teaches all of the positive steps of claims 22-23, 25, 27, 30-31, 33, and 35 except for using electron beam evaporation to deposit the single element metal layer and for wordlines, sourcelines and bitlines.

Ma teaches sputtering (column 2 line 20), chemical vapor deposition as an alternative (column 2 line 38) or as another alternative, evaporation deposition (column 2 lines 54-55), giving the three methods an art recognized equivalence. Ma is silent to the evaporation deposition method used; the broad group includes electron beam evaporation. The evaporation deposition method may include a single metal (column 2 lines 65-67) and oxidizing the metal (column 3 lines 1-4) to form a metal alloy. The metal is amorphous (column 3 lines 53-55 and 60-62), and is directly on (contacting) the body region (figure 12).

Park teaches depositing a metal layer (zirconium as in the instant claims and Ma) by either sputtering or electron beam deposition (column 4 lines 22-27), giving the two an art recognized equivalence.

Maiti teaches that devices (transistors) formed of a metal oxide with a high k metal oxide gate are commonly used for ICs. The admitted prior art (pages 1-4) teaches that these devices are commonly used in ICs, particularly for processor chips, mobile telephones, and memory devices. These devices commonly use wordlines, sourcelines, bit lines, and system busses. The gate is coupled to the metal oxide layer (Ma figure 13).

Regarding claims 23 and 31 both Ma (column 2 line 67) and Park) column 4 line 25) teach depositing a zirconium layer.

Regarding claims 25 and 33, the metal of Park is 99.0% pure or higher (column 4 lines 24-27).

Regarding claims 27 and 35, Ma teaches oxidizing at 400 degrees (column 3 line 2).

It would be obvious to one skilled in the requisite art at the time of the invention to modify Ma by using electron beam evaporation as taught by Park to be an art recognized equivalent to sputtering and to form wordlines, sourcelines, bit lines, and system busses as these are parts of the devices taught by the admitted prior art.

8. Claims 26, 28, 34, and 36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ma (US6207589) in view of Park (US 5795808) and in further view of Maiti (US6020024) and the admitted prior art (pages 1-4) and in further view of Yano (US5810923).

Ma, Park, Maiti and the admitted prior art teach all of the positive steps of claims 26, 28, 34, and 36 as recited above in regard to claims 22 and 30, except for the deposition temperature and the use of atomic oxygen.

Regarding claims 26 and 34, Park is silent as to the deposition temperature when using electron beam evaporation. Yano teaches zirconium is deposited at 300-700 degrees C, within the range of the instant claim.

Regarding claims 28 and 36, Yano oxidized with atomic oxygen (column 21, lines 35-36, oxygen, ozone, atomic oxygen, and NO2, teaching an art recognized equivalence), suggesting Ma also use atomic oxygen.

It would be obvious to one skilled in the requisite art at the time of the invention to modify Ma and Park by using a known deposition range for electron beam evaporation of zirconium as taught by Yano and to use atomic oxygen as taught by Yano to be an art recognized equivalence to oxygen. One would not perform undue and expensive laboratory efforts to obtain known values.

9. Claims 29 and 37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ma (US6207589) in view of Park (US 5795808) and in further view of Maiti (US6020024) and the admitted prior art (pages 1-4) and in further view of Moise (US 006211035).

Ma and Park teach all of the positive steps of claims 29and 37 as recited above in regard to claims 22 and 30, except for oxidizing in a krypton/oxygen mixed plasma.

Ma teaches annealing in an oxygen plasma including inert gases such as argon, and nitrogen (column 6 lines 64-65). Moise teaches oxidizing a metal layer with inert gasses such as argon or krypton (column 12 lines 23-24) giving the two an art recognized equivalence.

It would be obvious to one skilled in the requisite art at the time of the invention to modify Ma and Park by oxidizing a metal layer with inert gasses such as argon or krypton (column 12 lines 23-24) as taught by Moise to have an art recognized equivalence.

Response to Arguments

10. Applicant's arguments filed 6/13/05 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

The applicant points out that Ma teaches a metal gate oxide gate dielectric that includes 25% of a trivalent metal. However, Ma teaches the content of the trivalent metal to be **0**-50% (column 5 line66), thus there may be no trivalent metal present.

The applicant argues that Ma teaches a final structure with a barrier layer of 2-5 angstroms and of silicon nitride or silicon oxy-nitride. However, Ma teaches that there may be a surface anneal in oxygen (no nitrogen) (column 4 lines 4-10) and that the effect of this resulting surface film is minimal (column 5 lines 18-21). Further, in an alternate embodiment, Ma does not teach or suggest that the film is present, placing the metal directly on the semiconductor surface (figure 14).

The applicant argues that sputtering and evaporation (deposition) are not equivalent operations. The applicant further argues that sputtering creates physical and radiation damage to the substrate surface. The examiner realizes that there are advantages and disadvantages to all deposition methods. However, the teaching by Ma that sputtering, chemical vapor deposition, and evaporation methods may be used interchangeably, suggests that the art recognizes these as equivalents as far as being known alternate methods of placing material. The teaching of "evaporation deposition" is a strong suggestion for electron beam evaporation.

The applicant argues that Ma teaches a final structure as discussed above, however the barrier layer of Ma is not present in all embodiments, nor is the presence of

the trivalent metal. By Ma teaching the trivalent metal of 0% content, Ma places a single element metal as in the claims.

The applicant argues that (claims 14 and 51) recite "...evaporation depositing a substantially amorphous and substantially single element layer directly contacting the body region using electron beam evaporation, the metal being chosen from the group IV elements of the periodic table..." and claim 55 recites "...electron beam evaporation deposition depositing a substantially amorphous and substantially pure zircon layer directly contacting the body region..." and that these features are not suggested in any combination of the cited references as noted above. The applicant fails to point out which features (all?) are not present. As recited above, Ma teaches all of the positive steps (as argued), except for electron beam evaporation, which is strongly suggested. In combination with the other cited art, the examiner has shown that the art recognizes evaporation deposition as including electron beam deposition.

In regards to claims 5, 7, 18, and 20, the applicant traverses the rejection for the reasons above (reasons regarding the underlying independent claims). As recited above, Ma teaches all of the positive steps (as argued), except for electron beam evaporation, which is strongly suggested. In combination with the other cited art, the examiner has shown that the art recognizes evaporation deposition as including electron beam deposition.

The applicant argues (in regard to claims 8, 21, and54, that Ma teaches an oxidation of a CVD layer an not a single metal layer. However, Ma teaches that a single metal layer may be deposited by a evaporation technique (alternate deposition method) and oxidized. Thus the single deposited metal would be in the oxidizing atmosphere.

The applicant then traverses the rejection for the reasons above (reasons regarding the underlying independent claims). As recited above, Ma teaches all of the positive steps (as argued), except for electron beam evaporation, which is strongly suggested. In combination with the other cited art, the examiner has shown that the art recognizes evaporation deposition as including electron beam deposition.

In regards to claims 9-10 and 12, the applicant traverses the rejection for the reasons above (reasons regarding the underlying independent claims). As recited above, Ma teaches all of the positive steps (as argued), except for electron beam evaporation, which is strongly suggested. In combination with the other cited art, the examiner has shown that the art recognizes evaporation deposition as including electron beam deposition.

In regards to claim 13, the applicant traverses the rejection for the reasons above (reasons regarding the underlying independent claims). As recited above, Ma teaches all of the positive steps (as argued), except for electron beam evaporation, which is

strongly suggested. In combination with the other cited art, the examiner has shown that the art recognizes evaporation deposition as including electron beam deposition.

In regards to claims 22-23, 25, 27, 30-31, and 35, the applicant traverses the rejection for the reasons above (reasons regarding the underlying independent claims) including the intervening nitride layer. As recited above, Ma teaches all of the positive steps (as argued), except for electron beam evaporation, which is strongly suggested. In combination with the other cited art, the examiner has shown that the art recognizes evaporation deposition as including electron beam deposition. The intervening nitride layer is not present in all embodiments.

In regards to claims 26, 28, 34, and 36, the applicant traverses the rejection for the reasons above (reasons regarding the underlying independent claims). As recited above, Ma teaches all of the positive steps (as argued), except for electron beam evaporation, which is strongly suggested. In combination with the other cited art, the examiner has shown that the art recognizes evaporation deposition as including electron beam deposition.

In regards to claims 29 and 37, the applicant traverses the rejection for the reasons above (reasons regarding the underlying independent claims). As recited above, Ma teaches all of the positive steps (as argued), except for electron beam evaporation, which is strongly suggested. In combination with the other cited art, the

examiner has shown that the art recognizes evaporation deposition as including electron beam deposition.

Conclusion

11. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

12. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to David S. Blum whose telephone number is (571)-272-1687) and e-mail address is David.blum@USPTO.gov .

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Carl Whitehead Jr., can be reached at (571)-272-1702. Our facsimile number all patent correspondence to be entered into an application is (571) 273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

David S. Blum

August 22, 2005